

REMARKS

Claims 2, 9, 14 and 18 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, 15-17 and 19-26 remain in the application.

The references to Windows, Windows NT, Macintosh, Motorola, Intel and Pentium have been capitalized as requested by the Examiner. Generic terminology, where appropriate, remains in the surrounding context to such references.

Claims 7, 15, 19 and 23 have been objected for certain informalities. Regarding claims 7 and 19, "in" has been replaced by -a- as suggested by the Examiner. Regarding claim 23, "in" has been deleted as suggested by the Examiner. Regarding claim 15, "uuencoded" refers to a type of encoding as described by way of example in the specification on page 21, lines 19-22. Therefore, claim 21 has not been amended to change uuencoded to unencoded.

Applicants have provided additional claim amendments with this response to avoid additional informalities. Specifically, claims 3, 4, 10, 19 and 21 have been amended to maintain proper claim dependency, claim 15 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for a step, and claim 16 has been amended to remove a redundant step.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 22, 24, 25 and 26 are allowable and that claims 2-4, 9-12, 16, 18, 19, 21 and 23 would be allowable upon correction of informalities or if they were rewritten in independent form.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features recited in claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims 3 and 4 are patentably distinct over the cited references.

Claim 5 has been amended to include the features recited in claim 9 except for the scanning and sending steps. The reference to scanning is not included because if it was included it would not have antecedent basis (i.e. claim 5 does not have a scanning step to omit if the data is not of the type that is likely to be a virus). The reference to sending is not included because the data is transmitted to the destination if the data is not of the type that is likely to contain a virus. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 and its dependent claims 6-8, and 10-12 are patentably distinct over the cited references.

Claim 13 has been amended to include the features recited in claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 13 and its dependent claims 15, 17 and 19-26 are patentably distinct over the cited references.

Claim 16 has been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentably distinct over the cited references.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3-8, 10-13, 15-17 and 19-26 which remain in this application are solicited.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

SHAUNG JI, ET AL.

Date: September 24, 1996

By: 

Christopher M. Tobin
Registration No. 40,290
Fenwick & West LLP
Two Palo Alto Square, Suite 600
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(415) 858-7135
cmt@fwpa.com